UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/635,864	08/10/2000	Jeffrey M. Friedman	600-1-087CIP1	6312

7590 11/28/2001

David A Jackson Esq
Klauber & Jackson
411 Hackensack Ave
Hackensack, NJ 07601

EXAMINER	
SAOUD, CHRISTINE J	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1647	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2001

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)
09/635,864	FRIEDMAN et al.
Examiner	**Art Unit**
Christine Saoud	1647

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.** 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-58* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☒ Claims *1-58* are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.

12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:

1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

15) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
17) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
20) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

I. Claims 1-14, 23-27, drawn to polynucleotides, host cells, and recombinant methods of protein production, classified in at least class 435, subclass 69.1, for example.

II. Claims 15-16, drawn to probes and/or primers, classified in class 536, subclass 24.3, for example.

III. Claims 17-22, 51-52, drawn to polypeptides and pharmaceutical compositions, classified in class 530, subclass 350, for example.

IV. Claims 28-36, 48, drawn to antibodies and claims 56-57 in so far as they encompass antibodies, classified in class 530, subclass 387.1, for example.

V. Claims 37-43, drawn to a method of detecting protein in a sample using an antibody, classified in class 436, subclass 501, for example.

VI. Claims 44-47, drawn to a method of detecting disease by measuring protein, classified in class 436, subclass 501, for example.

VII. Claims 49-50, drawn to a method for changing body weight by inhibiting protein expression, classified in class 514, subclass 44, for example.

VIII. Claims 53-54, drawn to a method of reducing body weight by administration of protein, classified in class 514, subclass 2, for example.

IX. Claim 55, drawn to a method of reducing body weight by administration of nucleic acid, classified in class 514, subclass 44, for example.

X. Claims 56-57, drawn to an antagonistic compound, classified in class undetermined, subclass undetermined.

XI. Claim 58, drawn to a method of increasing body weight by administration of an antagonistic compound, classified in class undetermined, subclass undetermined.

2. The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons: Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation, different functions and different effects. Although the probes/primers are a smaller segment of the larger polynucleotide, as they have distinct actions and uses, they are shown to be "unrelated".

3. Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotides of Group I could be used in an entirely different method, such as in a method of detection of the polynucleotide in a sample, rather than in the recombinant production of the polypeptide of Group II.

4. Inventions III and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group III could be used for an entirely

different purpose such as in the method of Group VIII, rather than for the production of the antibodies of Group IV.

5. Inventions I, III-IV, X are also unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to chemically different compounds which can be made and used without each other. Furthermore, the inventions of Groups I, III-IV, X lack a common utility which is based upon a common special technical feature which is disclosed as being responsible for the common utility.

6. Inventions IV and (V-VI) are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the antibodies of Group IV could be used in an entirely different manner, such as in the purification of the polypeptide rather than in the methods of Groups V-VI.

7. Inventions III and VIII are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polypeptide of Group III could be used in an entirely

different manner, such as in a method of making antibodies rather than in the method of Group VIII.

8. Inventions I and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide of Group I could be used in an entirely different manner, such as in a method of making the polypeptide rather than in the method of Group IV.

9. Inventions X and XI are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the compound of Group X could be used in an entirely different method, such as in the production of antibodies, rather than in the method of Group XI.

10. Inventions V-IX, XI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are directed to methods which have different method steps, starting materials and goals, and are therefore, unrelated.

11. Inventions I and (V-VIII, XI) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polynucleotide of Group I is not required for any of the methods of Groups (V-VIII, XI).

12. Inventions II and (V-IX, XI) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the probes/primers of Group II are not required for any of the methods of Groups (V-IX, XI).

13. Inventions III and (V-VII, IX, XI) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required one for the other in that the polypeptide of Group III is not required for any of the methods of Groups (V-VII, IX, XI).

14. Inventions IV and (VII-IX, XI) are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions are not required for one for the other in that the antibodies of Group IV are not required for any of the methods of Groups (VII-IX, XI).

15. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and the necessity for non-coextensive literature searches, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Additional Restriction Requirement

16. The claims of Group I are drawn to a multitude of nucleic acids (SEQ ID NO:1, 2, 3, 22, encoding SEQ ID NO:4, SEQ ID NO:5, SEQ ID NO:6,), claims of Group II are drawn to a multitude of probes/primers (SEQ ID NO: 1, 3, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29), claims of Group III are drawn to a multitude of polypeptides (SEQ ID NO:2, 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 21), claims of Group IV are drawn to a multitude of antibodies thereto and methods which use these compounds. This constitutes a recitation of an implied, mis-joined Markush group that contains multiple, independent and distinct inventions. Each of the different nucleic acids/probes/primers/ polypeptides/antibodies/ and methods of use are independent and distinct because no common structural or functional properties are shared. Accordingly, these claims are subject to restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121.

Upon election of one of Groups I-XI, Applicant is additionally required to elect a single nucleic acid, probe/primer, polypeptide, or antibody (depending on the inventive Group which is elected). This requirement is not to be construed as a requirement for an election of species, since each of the compounds recited in alternative form is not a member of a single genus of invention, but constitutes an independent and patentably distinct invention. Applicant is also required to indicate which claims read on the elected invention.

17. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(I).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christine Saoud, Ph.D., whose telephone number is (703) 305-7519. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 7AM to 3PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Kunz, can be reached on (703) 308-4623.

Certain papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1 (CM1). The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993) and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (see 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). NOTE: If Applicant *does* submit a paper by fax, the original signed copy should be retained by Applicant or Applicant's representative. NO DUPLICATE COPIES SHOULD BE SUBMITTED so as to avoid the processing of duplicate papers.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (703) 308-4556. If this number is out of service, please call the Group receptionist for an alternate number. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (703) 308-0294. Official papers should NOT be faxed to 308-0294.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

November 28, 2001

CHRISTINE J. SAOUD
PRIMARY EXAMINER
Christine J. Saoud